

The meaning of a systematic error, a comment to "Reply to On the Systematic Errors in the Detection of the Lense-Thirring Effect with a Mars Orbiter", by Lorenzo Iorio

G. Felici

via Attilio Regolo 2, 20138, Milano, Italy

Abstract

The meaning of a systematic error is discussed here, in reply to some papers by Iorio claiming a measurement of the Lense-Thirring effect with the Mars Global Surveyor.

1 Systematic Errors

In "High-precision measurement of frame-dragging with the Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft in the gravitational field of Mars" by Lorenzo Iorio [1] a measurement of the Lense-Thirring effect by the field of Mars was claimed with an error of 0.5 %, by simply looking at the residuals of the Mars Global Surveyor.

Besides a number of other elementary mistakes and fundamental problems with this paper, such as: (a) having neglected the large uncertainties due to the daily orbital maneuvers of the spacecraft; (b) the fact that the 1.6 meters residuals refer to a period of a few days only and not to one year; (c) the wrong interpretation of their meaning, as pointed out by [3], etc., in a recent paper [4] the large size of the systematic errors was correctly remarked in this kind of observations with a Mars orbiter, amounting to approximately 5000 % of the Lense-Thirring effect, or more. To this paper, Iorio replied with another paper [2] in which is literally written:

"In fact, the average of the MGS out-of-plane RMS orbit overlap differences by (Konopliv et al. 2006) over the observational time span used by Iorio (2007a) amounts to 1.613 m only; there is no trace at all of the very huge bias postulated by Sindoni et al (2007) whose existence is, thus, neatly and unambiguously ruled out by the data processed by Konopliv et al. (2006)." In other words, here Iorio is essentially saying: "in the residuals of MGS the systematic errors calculated by Sindoni et al. are not observed, thus they are null!" However, the basic point is that, in general, systematic errors may not be detected. For example in the error analysis book by Bevington and Robinson [5], on page 3 is written:

"Errors of this type [systematics] are not easy to detect and not easily studied by statistical analysis."

For instance, a student can repeat many times the measurement of the distance of a table top and find very small deviations in his measurements, however these small deviations do not represent the total error of observation of his measurement because, for instance, all the measurement were done at a certain unknown temperature different than the calibration temperature of the meter stick and thus the thermal expansion of the stick introduced a systematic error in the measurement of the distance. The meaning of systematic errors is well explained in the introduction of the book by Bevington and Robinson [5], or by Topping [6] or in any another elementary book on error analysis.

References

- [1] Lorenzo Iorio, High-precision measurement of frame-dragging with the Mars Global Surveyor spacecraft in the gravitational field of Mars, arXiv:gr-qc/0701042v5, 23 Jan 2007.
- [2] Lorenzo Iorio, Reply to “On the Systematic Errors in the Detection of the Lense-Thirring Effect with a Mars Orbiter”, by Giampiero Sindoni, Claudio Paris and Paolo Ialongo, arXiv:gr-qc/0701159v3, 31 Jan 2007.
- [3] Kris Krogh, Iorio’s “high-precision measurement of frame-dragging with the Mars Global Surveyor”, arXiv:astro-ph/0701653v4, 6 Feb 2007.
- [4] Giampiero Sindoni, Claudio Paris and Paolo Ialongo, On the Systematic Errors in the Detection of the Lense-Thirring Effect with a Mars Orbiter, arXiv:gr-qc/0701141v1, 26 Jan 2007.
- [5] P.R. Bevington and D.K. Robinson, Data Reduction and Error Analysis for the Physical Sciences, McGraw-Hill (1992), page 3.
- [6] J. Topping, Errors of Observation and Their Treatment, Chapter 1, The Institute of Physics and the Physical Society (1955), page 9.